

Patent Application No.: 10/621,175
Attorney Docket No.: P10-1305

Page 2

Remarks

Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Objection to claims 7, 10, 13-15, 17 and 18: These objections are listed in the Office Action Summary, but no details are given in the Detailed Action. The Applicant is unable to respond to these objections.

Rejection of claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-9, 1, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Chandezon et al (US 6,554,038), Muhlhoff (US 2003/0136488A1, now US 6,834,694 B2)), and Eynard (US 6,598,644 B2). The Applicant has reviewed the pertinent bibliographic data for Muhlhoff '488A1 and Eynard '644B2 and these data are summarized for the Examiner's convenience as follows:

	Priority Data	Publication (in French)	Filing Date (US)
Muhlhoff '488A1	07/31/2000 (FR)	02/10/2002	01/29/2003
	07/10/2001 (WO)	02/07/2002	
Eynard '644B2	02/10/2000 (FR)	08/17/2001	07/30/2002
	02/05/2001 (WO)	08/16/2001	
This Application 10/621,175	01/17/2001 (FR)		
	12/20/2001 (WO)		

Therefore, based on the 01/17/2001 filing date in France of the instant application, neither Muhlhoff nor Eynard serve as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102 by virtue of the instant application having been filed before the publication of Muhlhoff or Eynard, further in view of the eventual publications in the French language, and still further in view of the common ownership of the applications at the time of filing.

As to Claim 3, it is noted that claim 3 is not included in the list of rejected claims, but is rejected in the text of the Examiner's remarks. The Examiner again relies only on the knowledge of one skilled in the art. As stated in the previous response, the Examiner supports this rejection on the personal statement that "ring reinforcement is a common and everyday occurrence throughout the tire design art." While ring reinforcement may be common place in the bead zone of a tire to provide anchoring to the mounting rim, the combination of a bead reinforcement and a sidewall reinforcement located in the claimed relative angular positions is not common place. The Applicant again respectfully asks the Examiner to provide a basis for his assertion.


Patent Application No.: 10/621,175
Attorney Docket No.: P10-1305

Page 3

Allowable Subject Matter: claims 7, 10, 13-5, 17-19: The Examiner states that these claims would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office Action. This Office Action contains no such rejections; therefore the Applicant is unable to respond to this purported rejection. It is noted that Applicant's representative unsuccessfully attempted to discuss these inconsistencies with the Examiner during a telephone call on April 18, 2005.

Thus the Applicant respectfully asserts that all claims 1'-20 are in condition for allowance, and that the Examiner issues a Notice of Allowance therefor. The rejection of claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-9, 1, and 20 has been traversed for the reasons stated above and that these claims are in condition for allowance. Furthermore remaining claims 12, 16, and 19 are allowable by virtue of their dependency on independent claim 1.

Respectfully submitted,



E. Martin Remick
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No.: 45,038

Michelin North America, Inc.
Intellectual Property Department
P.O. Box 2026
Greenville, South Carolina 29602
Telephone 864-422-4134
Fax 864-422-3517

Date: April 18, 2005